

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a Restriction/Election requirement over pending claims 1-21, 23-43, and 45-49.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/18/2007 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1, 2-6, 15-18, 23-29, 40, 41, 43, and 45, drawn to a system and method of business model representation and configuration for performance management and reporting, classified in class 705, subclass 7.
 - II. Claims 1, 7-14, 21, 23, 30-35, 36, 37, drawn to a system and methods of implementation of database extraction, transformation, and loading, classified in class 707, subclass 100.

- III. Claims 46, 47, and 49, drawn to a method for loading, receiving instructions for, and configuring a database, classified in class 707, subclass 1.
 - IV. Claims 19 and 20, drawn to an "operational framework" including a user interface console for configuring a database, classified in class 707, subclass 200.
 - V. Claims 39, 42, and 48, drawn to signals and a carrier wave for which a statutory class of invention cannot be determined.
4. Claims 1 and 23 are generic to the disclosed patentably distinct species identified above as inventions group I and II. The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. See MPEP 806.04(b).

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

5. Inventions I, II, III, and IV are each related to the others as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at

least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as providing for the modeling of a business based on dimensions, measures, and relationships. Subcombination II has separate utility such as facilitating access and loading of data to a database from external sources. Subcombination III has separate utility such as receiving instructions for operator loading and configuring of a database. Subcombination IV has separate utility such as providing a user interface for the configuring of a database. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

6. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

7. A telephone call was made to Attorney Xiang Lu on 3/5/2008 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Robertson whose telephone number is (571)272-8220. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:45am to 4:15pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dave Robertson/
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Romain Jeanty/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623